



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,213	10/17/2001	Johan Renes	5117US	5776
24247	7590	05/03/2007	EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT			GILLIGAN, CHRISTOPHER L	
P.O. BOX 2550			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			3626	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/03/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/981,213	RENES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Luke Gilligan	3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/8/07 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. In the amendment filed 2/8/07, the following has occurred: claims 9, 12, and 16 have been amended. Now, claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

5. Claim 9 has been amended to recite that the "two or more natural persons are a cohabiting same sex couple." Paragraph 0009 of the specification indicates that the described insurance policy could be applied to "a co-habitation agreement between a same sex couple." However, the remainder of the specification only describes the steps of claim 9, including "determining a periodic amount to be charged...," "charging that periodic amount...," and

"administering the insurance program..." in the context of the ending of a marriage through divorce. Therefore, the specification as originally filed would not have enabled one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention of claim 9 as amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden,

Breaking Up Without Going Broke (paragraphs numbered by Examiner) in view of Official Notice.

8. As per claim 9, Golden discloses a method of doing business comprising: determining a periodic amount to be charged a prospective participant for insurance covering at least some financial consequences of the untimely ending of a contractual relationship between two or more natural persons (see paragraph 15); charging that periodic amount in an insurance program over a period of time (see paragraph 15); and administering the insurance program (see paragraphs 15 and 16). Golden does not explicitly teach that the disclosed "divorce insurance" applies to cohabiting same sex couples. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that at the time of the invention it was old and well known in the art that some states permitted same sex marriage or same sex civil unions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the "divorce insurance" of Golden to a cohabiting same sex couple. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

Art Unit: 3626

motivated to apply the insurance in this manner for the purpose of helping to control the various costs of divorce (see paragraph 9).

9. Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden, **Breaking Up Without Going Broke** (paragraphs numbered by Examiner) in view of Roberts, U.S. Patent No. 4,839,804.

10. As per claim 12, Golden discloses a method of doing business comprising: determining a periodic amount to be charged a prospective participant for insurance covering at least some financial consequences of the untimely ending of a contractual relationship between two or more natural persons (see paragraph 15); charging that periodic amount in an insurance program over a period of time (see paragraph 15); and administering the insurance program (see paragraphs 15 and 16). Golden does not explicitly teach that the financial consequences comprise, in addition to legal fees, financial consequences selected from the group consisting of moving costs, a child's education, a former partner's education, health insurance premiums, life insurance premiums, and combinations thereof. Roberts teaches insurance to cover a child's education in the event of the death of a parent of the child (see column 3, lines 6-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine such coverage with the divorce insurance product of Golden. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine such coverage for the purpose of providing a form of child support as suggested by Golden (see paragraph 10 of Golden).

11. As per claim 1, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden further discloses said natural persons are living together (see paragraph 15, the Examiner interprets a married couple to be "living together" as recited).

12. As per claim 2, Golden discloses the method of claim 1 as described above. Golden further discloses said natural persons are legally married (see paragraph 15).
13. As per claim 3, Golden discloses the method of claim 2 as described above. Golden further discloses said untimely ending comprises a divorce between the natural persons (see paragraph 15).
14. As per claim 5, Golden discloses the method of claim 1 as described above. Golden further discloses said insurance program is part of another contract (see paragraph 15, note that the divorce insurance is offered ass a part of the company's legal insurance).
15. As per claim 8, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden further discloses the prospective participant is one of the two or more natural persons (see paragraph 15).
16. As per claim 10, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden further discloses limiting coverage for a certain time interval after the initiation of said contractual relationship (see paragraph 18).
17. As per claim 16, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden further discloses the periodic amount charged one of the two or more natural persons is changed in view of changed circumstances in that natural person's life (see paragraph 18).
18. As per claim 18, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden further discloses the periodic amount is a monthly amount (see paragraph 15).
19. As per claim 20, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden further discloses means to prevent fraud (see paragraph 18, the examiner considers the time limit to avoid problems with "quickie divorces" to be a form of "means to prevent fraud" as recited").

Art Unit: 3626

20. Claims 4, 11, 14-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden, **Breaking Up Without Going Broke** (paragraphs numbered by Examiner) in view of Roberts, U.S. Patent No. 4,839,804 and further in view of Covert, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0038681.

21. As per claim 4, Golden discloses the method of claim 1 as described above. Golden does not explicitly disclose a combination of other financial risks with some financial consequences of the untimely ending of a contractual relationship between natural persons in said insurance program. However, Covert teaches an insurance program that covers some financial consequences of the untimely ending of a contractual relationship between natural persons with other financial risks of the two or more natural persons (see paragraph 0036). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add coverage for additional financial risks of the two or more natural persons to the insurance program disclosed by Golden. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to add such coverage for the purpose of providing protection against additional expenses beyond those associated with the divorce itself (see paragraphs 0032-0033).

22. As per claim 11, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden does not explicitly disclose the charges for the periodic payments are paid by an entity not being one of the two or more natural persons in said contractual relationship. Covert teaches an insurance program that covers some financial consequences of the untimely ending of a contractual relationship between natural persons and wherein the charges for the periodic payments are paid by an entity not being one of the two or more natural persons in said contractual relationship (see paragraph 0061). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such teachings from Covert into the method disclosed by Golden for the reasons given above with respect to claim 4.

23. As per claim 14, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden does not explicitly disclose the periodic amount to be charged a prospective participant is based, in part, on the prospective participant's projected earnings. Covert teaches an insurance program that covers some financial consequences of the untimely ending of a contractual relationship between natural persons and wherein the periodic amount to be charged a prospective participant is based, in part, on the prospective participant's projected earnings (see paragraph 0036). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a feature into the method of Golden. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a feature for the purpose of tailoring premiums to characteristics of the participants (see paragraph 18 of Golden).

24. As per claim 15, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden does not explicitly disclose the periodic amount to be charged a prospective participant is based, in part, on the prospective participant's partner's projected earnings. Covert teaches an insurance program that covers some financial consequences of the untimely ending of a contractual relationship between natural persons and wherein the periodic amount to be charged a prospective participant is based, in part, on the prospective participant's partner's projected earnings (see paragraph 0036). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a feature into the method of Golden. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a feature for the purpose of tailoring premiums to characteristics of the participants (see paragraph 18 of Golden).

25. As per claim 17, Golden discloses the method of claim 16 as described above. Golden does not explicitly disclose that the change circumstances are selected from the listed group. Cover teaches an insurance program that covers some financial consequences of the untimely

Art Unit: 3626

ending of a contractual relationship between natural persons and wherein changed circumstances are selected from the listed group (see paragraph 0036). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such teachings from Covert into the method disclosed by Golden for the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

26. Claims 6-7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden, **Breaking Up Without Going Broke** (paragraphs numbered by Examiner) in view of Roberts, U.S. Patent No. 4,839,804 and further in view of Mooney, **Could Insurers Find Bliss In Divorce Market ?** (paragraphs numbered by Examiner).

27. As per claim 6, Golden discloses the method of claim 1 as described above. Golden does not explicitly disclose providing a payment to the two or more natural persons at an end date of insurance coverage in the event the contractual relationship between the two or more natural persons does not end untimely. Mooney discloses a divorce insurance product that suggests providing a payment to married couples at an end date of insurance coverage in the event that the marriage does not end untimely (see paragraph 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a provision into the method of Golden. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a provision for the purpose of providing an incentive to maintaining the marriage (See paragraph 12 of Mooney and paragraph 10 of Golden).

28. As per claim 7, Golden in view of Mooney disclose the method of claim 6 as described above. Golden does not explicitly teach a payment dependent on investment of the periodic amounts paid on behalf of said natural persons for said insurance policy. Mooney further discloses that the payment is dependent on investment of the periodic amounts paid on behalf

of said natural persons for said insurance policy (see paragraph 12, note that Mooney suggests structuring this feature like a whole life policy). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a provision into the method of Golden for the reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

29. As per claim 19, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden does not explicitly disclose investing at least a portion of the periodic amount. Mooney discloses investing at least a portion of a periodic amount paid for divorce insurance (see paragraph 12, note that Mooney suggests structuring this feature like a whole life policy). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a provision into the method of Golden for the reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

30. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden, **Breaking Up Without Going Broke** (paragraphs numbered by Examiner) in view of Roberts, U.S. Patent No. 4,839,804 and further in view of Flagg, U.S. Patent No. 6,456,979.

31. As per claim 13, Golden discloses the method of claim 12 as described above. Golden does not explicitly disclose the periodic amount to be charged a prospective participant is based, in part, on the prospective participant's age and the prospective partner's age. Flagg teaches an insurance policy that includes basing charge amounts on participant's age (see column 2, lines 13-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a feature into the method of Golden. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a feature for the purpose of tailoring premiums to characteristics of the participants (see paragraph 18 of Golden).

Response to Arguments

32. In the remarks filed 2/8/07, Applicants argue in substance that none of the applied prior art teaches features of the claims as amended. Applicants arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection detailed above.

Conclusion

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke Gilligan whose telephone number is (571) 272-6770. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5:30pm.

34. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

35. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

4/30/07



C. LUKE GILLIGAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600